

TUW - 93 - 25
 hep-th/9401110

Diffeomorphisms versus Non Abelian Gauge Transformations: An Example of 1+1 Dimensional Gravity

PETER SCHALLER*

THOMAS STROBL†

Institut für Theoretische Physik
 Technische Universität Wien
 Wiedner Hauptstr. 8-10, A-1040 Vienna
 Austria

submitted to: *Phys. Letts. B*

Abstract

We investigate the phase space of a typical model of (1+1) dimensional gravity (Jackiw-Teitelboim model with cylindrical topology) using its reformulation as a non abelian gauge theory based on the $sl(2, \mathbb{R})$ algebra. Modifying the conventional approach we argue that one should take the universal covering of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ rather than $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ as the gauge group of the theory. We discuss the consequences for the quantization of the model and find that the spectrum of the Dirac observables is sensible to this modification. Our analysis further provides an example for a gravity theory where the standard Hamiltonian formulation identifies gravitationally inequivalent solutions.

Vienna, December 1993

*e-mail: schaller@email.tuwien.ac.at

†e-mail: tstrobl@email.tuwien.ac.at

The identification of diffeomorphisms and non abelian gauge transformations is an important tool for the quantization of two and three dimensional gravity theories [1], [2]. Though this mechanism seemingly does not work in four dimensions [3], one may gain from it insight into the structure of quantum gravity theories, which might be significant for the quantization of four dimensional gravity, too. Thus it is worthwhile to investigate this identification thoroughly. The aim of the present paper is to perform such an investigation for the example of the (1+1) dimensional Jackiw-Teitelboim model [4].¹

In particular there are two points deserving a careful analysis:

- (1) The identification of non abelian gauge transformations on the one hand and gravitational symmetries (diffeomorphisms and local Lorentz transformations) on the other hand is defined on the Lie algebra level. It does not necessarily hold for transformations not smoothly connected to the unity. In (2+1) dimensional gravity it is well known that big diffeomorphisms which cannot be identified with gauge transformations play a crucial role (e.g. modular transformations on the torus for a space time manifold $T^2 \times \mathbb{R}$). In the case of the (1+1)-dimensional Jackiw-Teitelboim model on a cylinder the inverse effect occurs: Following the literature and taking $PSL(2, \mathbb{R}) \sim SO_e(2, 1)$ as the gauge group of the model, one finds gauge transformations not connected to the unity, which cannot be identified with gravitational symmetries. As we will show in the present article, this problem is overcome replacing $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ by its universal covering
- (2) Even at the infinitesimal level, the one to one correspondence between gauge transformations and gravitational symmetries breaks down for a degenerate space time metric (i.e. $\det g = 0$). At first sight one could think this to be irrelevant, as $\det g = 0$ corresponds to unphysical solutions. This argument is, however, erroneous in general. Let us illustrate this by the consideration of a simple analogous situation. Take the real line and as a symmetry group the group of translations with generator $T_1 = \partial/\partial q$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$. The application of this symmetry will reduce the real line to a point. Take another group, whose infinitesimal generator T_2 is identified with the generator of translations via $T_2 = qT_1$. Under the action of this group the real line will split into three gauge orbits: $\mathbb{R}^+$, $\mathbb{R}^-$ and $\{0\}$. Even if the point $q = 0$, where the correspondence between the infinitesimal actions of the two groups breaks down, is eliminated, we end up with different results. We will show in the present article that a similar mechanism occurs in the case of (1+1) dimensional gravity: Eliminating the solutions with $\det g = 0$, the gauge orbits split into components not smoothly connected to each other. Solutions from different components

¹In a similar analysis presented in [5] precisely the two points explained in the following text have been missed. This is due to subtleties in the special parametrization of the metric chosen in [5] (e.g. the two functions A and B in this parametrization may have poles and still render a C^∞ -metric).

of the same gauge orbit are not related by gravitational symmetry transformations. They correspond to space time manifolds with different kink number [6].

The action of the Jackiw-Teitelboim model, when written in Cartan's formulation with zweibein e^a , $a \in \{+, -\}$, spin-connection ω , and Lagrange multiplier fields (B_a, B_2) , reads

$$S = \int B_a (de^a + \varepsilon^a{}_b \omega \wedge e^b) + B_2 (d\omega + e^+ \wedge e^-), \quad (1)$$

The equations of motion yield a 1+1 dimensional space time with constant curvature and vanishing torsion. (The value of the curvature is proportional to a coupling constant which has been fixed to one in (1)). With the reinterpretation

$$A = e^a J_a + \omega J_2, \quad F = dA + A^2 \quad (2)$$

where J denotes the generators of the $sl(2, \mathbb{R})$ Lie algebra

$$[J_a, J_b] = \varepsilon_{ab} J_2, \quad [J_a, J_2] = \varepsilon^b{}_a J_b, \quad (3)$$

S becomes the action of a $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -gauge theory

$$S = 2 \int tr BF. \quad (4)$$

The equations of motion generated by (4) yield the connection A to be flat ($F \equiv 0$) and the Lagrange multiplier field B to be covariantly constant ($DB := dB + [A, B] \equiv 0$).

In addition to the identification of the actions (1) and (4), (2) induces a relation between the symmetries of the corresponding models: The Lie derivative of a vector field ξ acting on the one form A can be written as $L_\xi A = i_\xi F + D(i_\xi A)$ and therefore an infinitesimal diffeomorphism parametrized by ξ and an infinitesimal local Lorentz transformation parametrized by an angle θ can be identified on shell with gauge transformations $\delta A = D\Lambda$ via $\Lambda = i_\xi A$ and $\Lambda = \theta J_2$, respectively. It is easy to see that this identification extends to the B -fields also. With (2) the correspondence is seen to be one to one, iff $\det e \neq 0$.

Up to gauge transformations a flat connection A on a cylinder is determined by its monodromy $M_A = P \exp \oint A \in PSL(2)$ generating parallel transport around the cylinder (P denotes path ordering and the integration runs over a closed curve C winding around the cylinder once). With a 2π -periodic coordinate x^1 it can always be written as $A = A_1 dx^1$ where A_1 is constant and has one of the following forms

$$A^I = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha \\ \alpha & 0 \end{pmatrix} dx^1, \quad A^{II} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Theta \\ -\Theta & 0 \end{pmatrix} dx^1, \quad A^{III} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \pm 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} dx^1 \quad (5)$$

with $\alpha, \Theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and the identifications $\alpha \sim -\alpha$ and $\Theta \sim \Theta + 1/2$. The three cases *I*, *II*, *III* represent the hyperbolic, the elliptic, and the nilpotent sector of the moduli space of flat $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ connections on the cylinder, respectively. (Note that the nilpotent sector consists of two points only. There seems to be some confusion about that in the literature). In all of these three cases B is constant. It has the form

$$B^I = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c_1 \\ c_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B^{II} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c_2 \\ -c_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B^{III} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ c_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad c_i \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (6)$$

respectively. In the case $\alpha = 0$ we have the additional identification $c_1 \sim -c_1$ and the additional solutions

$$B^{IV} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \pm 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

(5-7) give a parametrization of the reduced phase space of the $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -gauge theory. Concerning the topological structure of the latter we want to mention here only that it is not Hausdorff. A more detailed analysis may be found elsewhere.

Now, the group elements

$$g_{(n)} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(nx^1/2) & \sin(nx^1/2) \\ -\sin(nx^1/2) & \cos(nx^1/2) \end{pmatrix} \quad n \in Z \quad (8)$$

applied to A^I and B^I yield

$$\begin{aligned} A_{(n)}^I &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \sin(nx^1) & \alpha \cos(nx^1) + n/2 \\ \alpha \cos(nx^1) - n/2 & -\alpha \sin(nx^1) \end{pmatrix} dx^1 \\ B_{(n)}^I &= c_1 \begin{pmatrix} \sin(nx^1) & \cos(nx^1) \\ \cos(nx^1) & -\sin(nx^1) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

It is obvious that these solutions, equivalent in the $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ gauge theory formulation for fixed values of α and c_1 but different values of n , cannot be transformed into each other by diffeomorphisms and local Lorentz transformations: The latter cannot change the number of zeros of B , which depends on n . This clearly indicates an inequivalence of $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ gauge transformations and gravitational symmetry transformations.

From a more general point of view the space of gauge transformations is the group of smooth mappings $G = \{g : S^1 \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow PSL(2, \mathbb{R})\}$. There is a natural homomorphism from G to the homotopy group $\Pi_1(PSL(2, \mathbb{R}))$. We thus have $\Pi_0(G) = \Pi_1(PSL(2, \mathbb{R})) \sim Z$, i.e. the space of gauge transformations consists of an infinite number of components not smoothly connected to each other. The group of diffeomorphisms and local Lorentz transformations consists of a finite number of such components only. They differ by x^0 - and x^1 -reflection on

the space time manifold and by parity transformation and time reversal in the Lorentz bundle. Up to these transformations the discrepancy between gauge transformations and gravitational symmetry transformations is removed by restricting the gauge transformations to the component $G|_e$ of G connected to the identity in G (and thus associated with the identity in the homotopy group). This is equivalent to choosing the universal covering $\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ rather than $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ as the gauge group of the theory: As $\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ is simply connected, the associated space of gauge transformations $\widetilde{G} = \{g : S^1 \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})\}$ is connected. We may see this equivalence also from another point of view: The covering map induces a natural identification $G|_e \sim \widetilde{G}/center(\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$. The elements of the center, however, generate trivial gauge transformations. To further elucidate this abstract identification let us choose a loop C running around the cylinder once and a point $\hat{x} \in C$. The connection A then generates a parallel transporter $M(x) = P \exp \int_{\hat{x}}^{x \in C} A$ and thus a path in the gauge group connecting the unity with the monodromy matrix M_A as defined above. The restriction of a gauge transformation $g \in G$ to C yields a closed loop γ in the gauge group. γ acts on $M(x)$ according to $M(x) \rightarrow \gamma(x)M(x)\gamma(\hat{x})^{-1}$. We may split γ into a constant group element and a based loop $\hat{\gamma}$: $\gamma(x) = \gamma(\hat{x})\hat{\gamma}(x)$, $\hat{\gamma}(\hat{x}) = 1$. $\hat{\gamma}$ identifies all paths $M(x)$ ending at the same monodromy matrix M_A whereas $\gamma(\hat{x})$ allows to identify monodromy matrices related by the adjoint action of the gauge group. With $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ being the gauge group, we end up with the configuration space $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})/Ad_{PSL(2, \mathbb{R})}$. A restriction to gauge transformations connected to the unity means to restrict $\hat{\gamma}$ to contractible loops. The latter generate smooth deformations of $M(x)$ only and thus identify paths corresponding to the same element in the universal covering of the gauge group. Thus, if we want to relate the BF theory to the Jackiw-Teitelboim model we are led to consider $\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})/Ad_{PSL(2, \mathbb{R})} \sim \widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})/Ad_{\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}$ rather than $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})/Ad_{PSL(2, \mathbb{R})}$ as the configuration space of the theory. The extension of this considerations to the entire phase space is straightforward.

A complete set of representatives for the components of G not smoothly connected to each other is given by (8). Thus we obtain a complete set of gauge inequivalent solutions of the gauge theory with gauge group $\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ by applying the gauge transformations (8) to (5-7). In the hyperbolic sector we obtain (9). In the elliptic sector the element $g_{(n)}$ induces a shift $\Theta \rightarrow \Theta + n/2$ in (5). Thus the transition to the universal covering simply removes the identification $\Theta \sim \Theta + 1/2$.

Analogous results are obtained in the remaining sectors of the phase space.

Still, our analysis is not complete. With the identifications (2) the solutions we obtain by the action of (8) on (5-7) correspond to space time manifolds with $\det g = 0$. To any of these solutions, however, it is possible to find a gauge transformation yielding a solution corresponding to a nondegenerate space time metric. More precisely, this can be done in an infinite number of gravitationally inequivalent ways. E.g. in the elliptic sector, we might apply one of the following

gauge transformations to A^{II}

$$g_{[k]} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_k & \sin \theta_k \\ -\sin \theta_k & \cos \theta_k \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & b_k \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\theta_k = [\exp(x^0) + 2|\Theta|] \sin(kx^1), \quad b_k = [\exp(x^0) + 2|\Theta|] \cos(kx^1) \quad k \in N. \quad (10)$$

We obtain

$$A_{[k]}^{II} = \begin{pmatrix} b_k(\Theta dx^1 + d\theta_k) & (1 + b_k^2)(\Theta dx^1 + d\theta_k) + db_k \\ (\Theta dx^1 + d\theta_k) & -b_k(\Theta dx^1 + d\theta_k) \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

The gauge transformations (10) are smoothly connected to the unity for arbitrary value of k as the θ_k are periodic functions in x^1 . Nevertheless the solutions $A_{[k]}^{II}$ are gravitationally inequivalent for different values of k . To prove this let us again choose a loop C running around the cylinder once. Under the restriction $\det g = \det e \neq 0$ the components of the zweibein (e_0^+, e_1^+) induce a map $C \sim S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ characterized by a winding number (not depending on the choice of C). Solutions with different winding numbers cannot be transformed into each other by gravitational symmetries, since they are separated by solutions with $\det e = 0$. (Also the discrete gravitational symmetry transformations mentioned above do not change the winding number). For different values of k the solutions (11) have different winding numbers, which proves our assertion.

This result generalizes to the other sectors of the theory: Solutions which are gauge equivalent in the $\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ gauge theory are not equivalent in the gravity theory, if they have different winding number.

The winding number defined above is related to the kink number as defined in [6] by means of 'turn arounds' of the light cone along non contractible loops. More precisely, winding number k corresponds to kink number $2k$. (Odd kink numbers [6] characterize solutions which are not time orientable. Such solutions are not considered here).

The physical relevance of solutions with nontrivial winding number is not quite clear. They necessarily contain closed lightlike curves. There are, however, also solutions with trivial winding containing closed lightlike curves. At this point it might be interesting to note that in a conventional Hamiltonian treatment of the action (1) the constraints will generate infinitesimal gauge transformations rather than gravitational symmetry transformations. Thus on the Hamiltonian level the kink number will not appear in the parametrization of the reduced phase space, while, however, not all solutions with closed timelike curves can be excluded in this way. A similar situation occurs also when treating other models of two dimensional gravity (cf. e.g. [7]). It would be interesting to see, if the equivalence up to $\det g = 0$ of the Hamiltonian and Lagrangian formulation of four dimensional gravity leads to similarly inequivalent factoring spaces.

Let us close this letter by some remarks on the quantization of the model: The application of a Dirac quantization procedure in a configuration space representation of the quantum theory will yield a quantum Hilbert space consisting of

functions over the space $\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})/Ad_{PSL(2, \mathbb{R})}$ (rather than $SL(2, \mathbb{R})/Ad_{PSL(2, \mathbb{R})}$ as suggested in [1]). The most remarkable consequence of the transition to the universal covering of the gauge group is that the sector of the phase space corresponding to the connections A^I in (5) (elliptic sector) is compact in the BF theory, but becomes noncompact upon transition to the universal covering of the gauge group. Thus, in this sector, the corresponding momentum operator (i.e. the Dirac observable $\det B$) will have a discrete spectrum in the $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -gauge theory, but a continuous spectrum in the gravity theory.

One of the authors (T. S.) wants to thank M. Henneaux for discussions at the 3rd RIM Baltic Student Seminar, where partial results of this work have been presented (the corresponding proceedings will be published in L.N.P.).

References

- [1] T. Fukuyama and K. Kamimura, *Phys. Lett.* **160B** (1985) 259; K. Isler and C. Trugenberger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63** (1989) 834; A. Chamsedine and D. Wyler, *Phys. Lett.* **B228** (1989) 75; *Nucl. Phys.* **B340** (1990) 595.
- [2] A. Achúcarro and P. Townsend, *Phys. Lett. B* **180** (1986) 85; E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B311** (1988) 46.
- [3] T. Strobl, *Phys. Rev. D* **48/10** (1993) 5029.
- [4] C. Teitelboim, *Phys. Lett.* **126B** (1983) 41; R. Jackiw, *1984 Quantum Theory of Gravity*, ed S. Christensen (Bristol: Hilger) p 403.
- [5] J. Navarro-Salas, M. Navarro, V. Aldaya, *Phys. Lett. B* **292** (1992) 19; M. Navarro, V. Aldaya, *Nucl. Phys.* **B403** (1993) 291.
- [6] D. Finkelstein and C. W. Misner, *Ann. Phys. (NY)* **6**, 230 (1959); cf. also K. A. Dunn, T. A. Harriott, J. G. Williams, *J. Math. Phys.* **33/4** (1992) 1437, where, however, the solutions in chapter V do not correspond to constant curvature solutions on a cylinder.
- [7] T. Klösch and T. Strobl, in prep.